1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	No. 1:09-cr-10054-MLW-1
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
7	VS.
8	HUMZA ZAMAN
9	HOPZA ZAPAN
10	
11	*****
12	Ear Hearing Defere
13	For Hearing Before: Chief Judge Mark L. Wolf
14	
15	Sentencing
16	
17	United States District Court
18	District of Massachusetts (Boston.) One Courthouse Way
19	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 March 11, 2010
20	
21	* * * * * *
22	
23	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR Official Court Reporter
24	United States District Court One Courthouse Way, Room 5200, Boston, MA 02210
25	bulldog@richromanow.com

```
1
                       A P P E A R A N C E S
 2
 3
    STEPHEN P. HEYMANN, ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
       John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse
 4
       1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
       Boston, MA 02210
 5
       (617) 748-3100
       Email: Stephen.heymann@usdoj.gov
 6
       For the United States
 7
    PATRICK J. BRACKLEY, ESQ.
 8
       Law Office of Patrick J. Brackley
       233 Broadway, Suite 801
 9
       New York, NY 10279
       (212) 334-3736
10
       Email: Patrickbrackley@aol.com
11
       For the defendant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (Begins, 3:00 p.m.) 3 THE CLERK: Criminal Matter 09-10054, the 4 United States versus Humza Zaman. The Court is in 5 session. You may be seated. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Would counsel 6 7 please identify themselves for the Court and for the 8 record. MR. HEYMANN: Your Honor, Stephen Heymann on 9 10 behalf of the government. 11 MR. BRACKLEY: Patrick Brackley for the 12 defendant, Mr. Zaman. Good afternoon, Judge Wolf, sir. 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 14 All right. We're here today for Mr. Zaman's 15 sentencing. 16 Mr. Heymann, does the Government believe there are 17 identifiable victims who the law requires to be notified 18 of this proceeding? 19 MR. HEYMANN: No, it does not, your Honor. 20 The nature of the defendant's conduct, in this 21 particular matter, was, um -- involved variants of money 22 laundering, but the government cannot link the particular money that he was laundering to a particular 23 24 victim, and for that reason the government does not 25 believe that there are particular victims that are

required to be here today.

THE COURT: Okay. That was my understanding from reading the presentence report.

This is a sentencing that was originally scheduled for August of 2009. In response to a joint motion to continue it, I rescheduled the matter for February 10, 2010. On February 8th, the defendant's attorney filed a motion to continue that sentencing hearing because of other matters on his schedule and stated that he would be available any day of the week of March 8th, so therefore I scheduled the sentencing for today. Two days ago, on March 9, I received another motion to continue. Yesterday, on March 10, the government opposed that motion. And yesterday, for reasons described in my order, I denied that request.

Is there any impediment to proceeding today?

MR. BRACKLEY: No, Judge, I'm happy to be here, your Honor. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. I have the presentence report as to which there are no objections from the defendant. I have the government's sentencing memorandum. I have a release letter reporting on the defendant's compliance with his conditions of release, that with regard to one matter dated March 10, 2010.

Is there anything else I should have received and

read?

MR. BRACKLEY: No, your Honor.

MR. HEYMANN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'd like to try to assure we have a common sense of the legal framework. We're operating under the Advisory Guideline System now in effect. That legal framework is succinctly described, I believe, by the Supreme Court in *Gall*.

It instructs that "A district court should begin all sentencing proceedings by correctly calculating the applicable guideline range. The guidelines should be the starting point. The guidelines are not the only consideration, however. After giving both parties an opportunity to argue for whatever sentence they deem appropriate, I must consider all of the Section 3553(a) factors to determine whether they support the sentence required by the parties. I may not presume that the guideline range is reasonable. I must make an individualized assessment based on the facts presented. If I decide a departure or a variance is justified, a major departure must be supported by a more significant justification than a minor one, and I must explain the reasons for the sentence I ultimately impose."

Do the parties agree that's a fair statement of the legal framework?

```
MR. HEYMANN: Yes, your Honor.
 1
 2
                MR. BRACKLEY: Yes, Judge.
                THE COURT: We're operating under the
 3
     quideline manual now in effect with the amendments
 4
 5
     effective November 1, 2009.
           Mr. Brackley, have you and Mr. Zaman each read the
 6
 7
     presentence report?
                MR. BRACKLEY: Yes, Judge.
8
                THE COURT: And there are no objections. But
 9
     is there anything that you or he feel is inaccurate?
10
11
                MR. BRACKLEY: No, Judge.
12
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zaman, did you read the
     presentence report?
13
14
                THE DEFENDANT: I did, your Honor. Yes, sir.
15
                THE COURT: And is there anything in there you
     feel is inaccurate?
16
17
                THE DEFENDANT: Um, the only thing is there is
18
     a date for the state trial of like the 24th, I believe,
19
     at the moment.
20
                THE COURT: Okay. And this is for the
     possession of the knife -- the alleged possession of the
21
     knife?
22
23
                                Right.
                THE DEFENDANT:
24
                THE COURT: And you're saying there is a date
25
     for that event?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll make a mental note of that. But I can tell you that, at this time, I don't view the allegations concerning the knife to be what we call "material." I'm not going to take them into account in deciding what the sentence should be. It doesn't affect the guideline range. As far as I know, the government's not basing its argument on it.

MR. HEYMANN: Your Honor, the government concurs completely that it has no bearing whatsoever on the sentencing guidelines here or on the sentence that the Court is going to consider for this offense. To whatever extent it has any bearing, it has on later release issues, but nothing concerning the sentencing itself.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to impose the sentence I would have imposed as if the knife -- that information about the knife was not in the presentence report. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So I believe that the government's objections all resulted in corrections.

There's nothing on which I need to rule. Is that correct?

MR. HEYMANN: Yes, that's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Therefore, as I understand it, the Total Offense Level is 23, the Criminal History Category is 1, the guidelines are 46 to 57 months in prison and 24 to 36 months supervised release, a fine range of 10,000 to 100,000 dollars, and a 100 dollar special assessment.

Do the parties agree that those are the guideline ranges?

MR. HEYMANN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BRACKLEY: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. What then is the government's recommendation and what are the reasons for it, please?

MR. HEYMANN: Your Honor, the government's recommendation is the low end of that guideline range, which is 46 months incarceration, a 75,000 dollar fine — an amount intended to equal the approximate amount that the defendant, um, was paid during the course of the conspiracy, no restitution in light of 18 U.S.C. Section 3663(a)(1)(B)(ii), the section that we actually alluded to earlier, a 100 dollar special assessment, 3 years supervised release, and then as, um, a condition of that supervised release, that the defendant, um, not have access to third parties' identity or financial records absent prior approval of his supervising

probation officer, and that, um, any employer that he might be employed by during that period of supervision, that, um, who would have access to that kind of information, would be provided a copy of the indictment in this case, to which he has pled guilty, so that the employer could make a full and knowledgeable decision as to what his view was as to whether or not he should have access to it.

THE COURT: Okay. And what are the reasons for the recommendation, please?

MR. HEYMANN: I'm sorry, your Honor. The reasons for the recommendation are the following. I want to be -- Humza Zaman was part of an organization that committed computer crimes and identity thefts on an unprecedented scale. Absolutely unprecedented. The government, um, has not alleged, nor does it want to allege here that the defendant himself participated in the hacking into the computer networks or participated into the data theft itself, but he was fully knowledgeable of what was going on. He was intimate friends of Steven Watt who prepared the program that was used in --

THE COURT: You mean he was "close" friends?

MR. HEYMANN: Close friends. Yes, close

friends. He was close friends with Steven Watt. He

was, as he pled guilty to and he did, in fact, do, he sent, um, confidential records from his own employer down to Albert Gonzalez to see whether Albert Gonzalez could take advantage of those. He knew what --

THE COURT: This was Barclays -- he was working at Barclays Bank in what capacity?

MR. HEYMANN: As a -- in computer systems. In the security part of the computer systems.

THE COURT: And he sent something called "logs" of Barclays?

MR. HEYMANN: Logs. The computer keeps records of what it's doing and the records are simply called "logs," and he sent logs of ATM transactions that the computer was keeping down to Albert Gonzalez to see whether he could take advantage of those logs. So he knew what Albert Gonzalez was doing, he knew what the organization was doing, but there's no allegation that he, himself, was a perpetrator of one of the intrusions.

But that having been said, though, an organization of this size, of this magnitude, does not function, cannot function unless it can sell its goods, and once it sells its goods, whether it can get its money and distribute it and pay its people.

As the presentence report reflects, Christopher Scott was paid somewhere between 300 and 500,000 dollars

in cash over time, Patrick Tuey received something less than \$100,000, the defendant received about \$75,000. The business functions for the purpose of getting cash and needs cash and needs to get it back into the country in a form that it can pay its people and profit from it, and his role was critical in that regard.

So the government's recommendation of --

THE COURT: So why don't you remind me of what his role was?

MR. HEYMANN: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I mean, I've read this, but --

MR. HEYMANN: I'm sorry, your Honor. What happened here is the following.

Albert Gonzalez often required that he be paid either in transfers to a bank account in Latvia, one or more bank accounts in Latvia, or he be paid in web currencies, virtual currencies that you can exchange over the Internet. Egold used to be one of them, purportedly tied to a gold standard, which may or may not have existed, but Egold used to be one of them. Web Money, out of Russia, is another one. But these virtual currencies or the Latvian bank accounts, while extremely good for concealing the source origin of the proceeds of this illegal activity, doesn't provide any cash that you can spend in the United States. And you've got to get

that back into the United States and you've got to, once you get it back into the United States, you've got to get it down to Albert Gonzalez.

So one thing the defendant did is Albert Gonzalez gives him the name -- this is the first \$38,000, gives him some fictitious names belonging to fictitious or, um, straw account holders in Latvia. He goes to an ATM in New York, pulls out \$38,000, takes his cut, and sends it down to Albert Gonzalez.

On another occasion, another group of occasions, Albert Gonzalez manages to get the money available in San Francisco.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. Taking it from the ATM, did that require any of the defendant's computer expertise?

MR. HEYMANN: It does not require -- it requires him simply to have an ATM card with false information on it, or an ATM card of somebody else's, but it did not require his computer expertise, no.

THE COURT: So somebody else gave him the card?

MR. HEYMANN: Somebody else gave him the card or the card number, yes. I guess the most candid way of putting it is that I could do it. If somebody gives me the card number, I could go up to the machine and do

it.

Um, it was a big hunk of money and, as I said in the description to the Court, I can only approximate it because nobody has -- there are no critical records of it, but this is three transactions of somewhere between 50 and \$370,000 apiece. We know of the \$370,000 one because, again, on a logged chat communication, we can see Albert Gonzalez telling him that \$375,000 is available. Um, he then flies out to San Francisco, meets with somebody who is of foreign descent, gets handed several hundred thousand dollars in cash, and gets it back to Albert Gonzalez in a way that completely protects Gonzalez from any linkage to the money.

THE COURT: But gets it back -- so he's a courier?

MR. HEYMANN: He ships it back. I mean, he's -- he wasn't actually physically shipping it back, but he is the courier in the transaction.

THE COURT: But, again, he wasn't using his expertise with computers to repatriate the money for the United States?

MR. HEYMANN: That's correct. The only time he ever uses his expertise with computers is the time that the Court raised earlier about the Barclays system logs, um, and that we do not have any evidence that

those Barclays system logs were ever, in fact, used in an improper way. But what they do evidence is his knowledge of Albert Gonzalez and the activities that he was involved in. And the last thing that happens is, on three occasions, each for something less than \$100,000, he meets with yet another stranger, on these occasions in New York, again is given cash, and again sends it down to Albert Gonzalez.

It's impossible to say with exact precision -- or with precision -- well, I guess, "precision" is always exact, um, how much that is. The guideline range is 400,000 to a million. There's no evidence that it went over a million dollars. Because we start with 38,000 and 370,000, so we know it's over 400,000, and the best approximation is 6 to 800,000, roughly 700,000 in the mail.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Brackley.

MR. BRACKLEY: Yes, Judge. As I think the

Assistant United States Attorney accurately

characterizes, Mr. Zaman, I think, found himself as a

gopher carrying money, ferrying money, which was

obviously the illegal proceeds of what we now know to be

a sprawling conspiracy, and I think, Judge, that your

questions as to what his role was are accurate in the

sense that he was on the foothold of becoming a much

more complex fraudster, if I think he had not been arrested, is I think what Mr. Heymann was saying.

However, he was fortunately not given that opportunity.

But what I think the record will bear out is that he, at the time, got himself involved with these individuals who were living "the high life," as you would say, a tremendous amount of drugs, every recreational drug known to man --

THE COURT: Well, where do I see that in the record?

MR. BRACKLEY: I think it's in the presentence report, your Honor.

THE COURT: I mean, I have a -- I mean, I do have a report regarding his drug use in the period, but I didn't see a nexus with Mr. Gonzalez or the others in the presentence report, I don't think.

MR. BRACKLEY: It's -- Mr. Zaman actually came to meet his co-conspirators in hanging around in clubs and using drugs and that is how he was ensnared into the conspiracy. Only then they became friends and associates and then he began to use the opportunity to commit crimes for them for whatever cash they would give to him. And I believe, Judge, as you're aware, this is the first time that he's ever been arrested.

He, I believe, got into this conspiracy at a time

```
close to the death of his father. He had been, as they
 1
     say, lost in the world and these individuals provided
 2
 3
     him with some way to make easy money. Um --
 4
                THE COURT: He was making $130,000 a year at
 5
     Barclays.
 6
                MR. BRACKLEY: That's correct.
 7
                THE COURT: That's not, for most people, a
8
     desperate financial situation.
 9
                MR. BRACKLEY: That's correct, Judge, but it
10
     was cash and it went along with the club scene that this
11
     man found himself in with these individuals. I think
12
     that's how the money --
13
                THE COURT: All right. Excuse me just one
14
     second.
15
                (Pause.)
16
                THE COURT: Go ahead.
17
                MR. BRACKLEY: Judge Wolf, I would also
18
     request the low end in that this man did not involve
19
     himself in any of the complicated computer
20
     transactions. That Barclays situation, I think, shows
21
     that he was trying to do that, at some point, but
22
     fortunately all of that was thwarted. As the assistant
23
     says, there's no evidence that that resulted in any
24
     further loss or any further crime.
25
           So I would ask, Judge, similarly for the low end
```

of that guideline range in that there's no substantial aggravating factors here that would warrant an upward departure in any regard.

THE COURT: Mr. Zaman, you now have an opportunity but not an obligation to speak before I decide what sentence to impose. That means you don't have to say anything, if you don't want to, but if there's something you would like to say, now is the time.

THE DEFENDANT: Um, I'm sorry, your Honor.

You're right. You know, um, 130 was not really

desperate financial times. I mean, looking back on it,

you know, just knowing that I'm probably not going to be

able to make that kind of cash income for the rest of my

life, whereas it is, you know, pretty much certain that,

even if I continue down the right path, it's definitely

something I will recognize every day now. And I realize

there's no -- there's no real excuse for, you know, just

wanting to enhance your lifestyle to a level that you

don't really deserve even if, you know, the opportunity

definitely was too good to be true, um, in any real

sense.

And, um, I'm trying to, you know, like build some semblance of a career and, you know, like -- you know, it's been hard, you know, with all the add-on elements

that happen in your life when undergoing a situation like this. But I have, you know, I've been clean, as far as my substance issues go, and I would just ask the Court for, um, an opportunity to perhaps rebuild what life I can.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. Your attorney asked me to give you the same sentence that the government asked me to give you, 46 months. Would you ask me to give you a lower sentence than that?

THE DEFENDANT: I would, your Honor, you know, if it's possible. I mean, incarceration seems a little bit harsh to me. Obviously it's not my call, but it just -- you know, your Honor, I know what I did, um, is pretty, um -- and, you know, the extent of the guidelines are pretty scary, but, you know, I don't -- I mean, I would just ask to, you know, um, to not be incarcerated, if I can.

THE COURT: All right. And I had noticed from the presentence report that you've been taking some courses, I think, on financial planning through the Harvard Extension School. Is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Right. Well, I finished that one now and I'm hoping, in the summer, if I'm around, to go full time there, because I've met the requirements necessary for full-time enrollment there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. And am I right that you haven't told your family or other people about the charge against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I haven't told my mom because, you know, she's like relatively recently widowed and I would -- I mean, I'm just going to try not to ever have her find out, to be honest, your Honor, um, you know, if I can do it, even, whatever happens, you know, as long as it doesn't, you know, like affect her. And my sister and, you know, brother, you know, they -it will get back to her. I mean, some of my closest friends do know. I've called them pretty much. But as long as long as my mom -- well, it's a tough call because, you know, it might be necessary for her to have been prepped, depending on what my sentence is, but if she finds out another way, um, how bad that could be. But I think it's just a decision I kind of made to like try to mask her from this as long as I humanly possibly can.

THE COURT: Thank you. Here, let me just ask you a couple of other things to make sure that I understand. You mentioned one.

You haven't tested positive for drugs while you've been out on pretrial release, right?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: And you've been able to do the
 1
     Harvard Extension School and start a couple -- try to
 2
 3
     start a couple of businesses, is that right?
 4
                THE DEFENDANT: Basically, yes, your Honor.
 5
                THE COURT: All right. And you certainly seem
     to understand what I've said today and you've responded
 6
 7
     to it.
 8
           You do understand what's going on here today?
                THE DEFENDANT: Um, yeah. Yes, sir.
 9
10
                THE COURT: And have you talked to
11
     Mr. Brackley in preparation for the sentencing today?
12
                THE DEFENDANT: I mean, yeah, right before it,
13
     we spoke briefly. Yes, your Honor.
14
                THE COURT: Okay. You may seated for a
15
     moment.
16
                THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
17
                (Is seated.)
18
                THE COURT: All right. Mr. Zaman, please
19
     stand.
20
                (Defendant stands.)
                THE COURT: In connection with the one count
21
22
     to which you've pled guilty, I hereby sentence you to
23
     serve 46 months in the custody of the Attorney General
24
     of the United States to be followed by 3 years of
25
     supervised release on the standard conditions and --
```

which include that you do not commit another crime, that you provide a DNA sample, and the following special conditions:

You may not possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon, including a knife. You must pay a 75,000 dollar fine on a schedule that I will determine. You may not have access to any third-party identification issue or financial records without the express approval, in advance, of Probation.

You must inform any potential employer of the charges and conviction against you and if you're seeking any position involving finance, you must not incur any new credit charges or open any additional lines of credit without the approval of the Probation Office as long as any of your financial obligations are outstanding. You must provide the Probation Office access to any requested financial information which may be shared with the United States Attorney.

You must participate in a program for drug testing and treatment, as prescribed by Probation, which can include up to 104 tests a year. If you have the funds or the insurance to pay or contribute to the cost, you must pay or contribute to the cost of that treatment. There's also a mandatory 100 dollar special assessment.

In your plea agreement, you've waived your right

to appeal except with regard to any legally-incorrect guideline calculation. There's been no objection to the guideline calculation, but if you want to appeal on that basis and you cannot afford a lawyer, one will be appointed to represent you at public expense.

What I've done is give you the sentence that I find is sufficient and no more than necessary to serve the statutory goals of sentencing. And while maybe some additional arguments could have been made on your behalf, I don't imagine, based on the information I have, how they would have altered the sentence. I actually thought of giving you a higher sentence because — and I think the statute provides the framework for explaining this and I'm going to explain to you why I think that those 46 months are the minimum necessary to serve the purposes that a sentence is required to serve.

I've had to consider your personal history and characteristics. And I regularly sentence people who come from very difficult backgrounds or who have mental illnesses, and that's not you. A look at the presentence report tells me that you were born into a fine family, that you were blessed with real intelligence, that you had the highest SATs, I think, in your high school in New York, that you got the opportunity to leave high school and go to college

early, but that you ended up back in high school because of drug use, if I read it correctly. But you're an intelligent person who was raised in a family that didn't abuse you.

You had progressively more responsible jobs that paid you better and better. You know, it looks like, in five to six years, you went from making about \$30,000 to making \$130,000. You were very adept with computers. You had a good future. And the history -- the nature and circumstances of the offense is you voluntarily got in with people that you knew were swindlers on a huge scale and simply for greed, as far as I can see, decided to try to help them succeed. And here you've been punished for being the courier, but, you know, you took confidential information of your employer, Barclays Bank, and gave it to Mr. Gonzalez and asked him if he could find some criminal use for it. This doesn't demonstrate any kind of reluctance.

The sentence has to recognize the seriousness of the offense and your guidelines haven't been calculated, your sentence hasn't been decided based on the huge scope of the international fraud, but moving money around was an important part of it and you moved a lot, and you didn't do it just once, you did it several times and you did it for the most conventional of motives, as

far as I can tell, greed.

The sentence has to be sufficient to send two kinds of messages and one is to you, that this is serious and you'd better not do it again. It also needs to send a message to other people like you, similarly situated to the way you were several years ago, you know, to people who may be bright, who may have responsible positions, but who may want even more and have attempted to engage in illegal conduct to get more money. The sentence needs to send the message that that's not just wrong, but it's dumb. You'll get caught. You'll get convicted. You'll get seriously punished. And to the extent that the sentence sends a deterrent message to you, it will protect the public in the future.

I don't find that you need any vocational training or medical care, but I will recommend that you be offered drug treatment while you're in prison. I think you've been doing a good job, the last couple of years, and it shows you have discipline, as well as intelligence, but up until now, not wisdom. But I want that drug treatment to be available to you in prison as well as when you get out of prison.

And I've given some thought to the guidelines and they describe, um, what the Sentencing Commission thinks

should usually be the range for a person like you who did what you did, and sometimes I give a lower sentence, but I just don't see a good reason to give a lower sentence here. Sometimes I even give higher sentences and I think a higher sentence would be reasonable, but the sentence that I've given you should be sufficient and therefore I'm not imposing a higher sentence.

When you get out, you'll be under the supervision of the Probation Department for 3 years and it's going to be important that you continue to work with Probation, as you've worked with Pretrial Services, and that you behave.

I've proposed a \$75,000 fine because that seems to be roughly what you made from this and I think you have the potential to honestly earn money in the future, although your opportunities will be injured by this conviction. You know, you earned that money, so you're going to have to pay that fine.

You'll be on supervised release, as I said, for 3 years. If you commit any further crimes, you'll get caught, you can get brought back in front of me, you can be locked up for 3 more years in this case, and then you'll be prosecuted for whatever caused you to have your supervised release revoked here. So I hope, for your sake, really, that this sentence will serve its

purpose.

You had an opportunity to go to college at an young age and you were immature and you apparently abused drugs and you lost that chance. You had an opportunity for a fine career in a growing field, technology, and you weren't satisfied with that, previously. So when you have to start all over again, I hope you'll be determined to use your intelligence and your energy only for honest purposes and I hope that you succeed. You may be seated.

(Defendant is seated.)

THE COURT: Now, there's a question as to whether the defendant should begin serving his sentence today or whether he wishes to request an opportunity to self report.

MR. BRACKLEY: Judge, I would respectfully request the opportunity that he self report.

THE COURT: What's the government's view on that?

MR. HEYMANN: Your Honor, if I could take that in two parts. The Government has no evidence and sees no evidence of his being a danger to the community right now, you know, that the -- either for his previous offenses here or in any allegations that have occurred over the past several months. Um, the government is

concerned, however, that he has not told any family members, that he has no apparent ties to hold him in place, and that he's now facing a lengthy sentence, and under those circumstances it's difficult to conclude, by clear and convincing evidence, that he's not a likelihood of flight. It's that second prong that causes the government pause.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. HEYMANN: But, to be clear, he has otherwise not -- he has appeared here today and has not otherwise violated any of his conditions.

THE COURT: My question to you is not rhetorical. I don't know that -- I haven't thought through what the standard for being released pending appeal applies because I don't -- because it appears to me, although it may not ultimately be up to me, that he's waived his right to appeal and usually the question on self-reporting doesn't get analyzed in that framework, but perhaps it should.

But I guess that's the -- and I'll actually say
the following. The motion that Mr. Brackley filed to
continue talked about the defendant needing drug
treatment or maybe mental health counseling, and I know
that this is stressful. I asked the Pretrial Services
to check with Pretrial Services in New York. They tell

me, um, what's been confirmed by the defendant today, that he's been complying with the conditions of his release other than that state court case that will have to be resolved. He's been drug tested about three times a month and he's never tested positive for narcotics.

I've been alert to whether there was any question about his competence. The discussion he had with me shows that he understands what's going on. He was able to express himself very well, although he didn't persuade me not to put him in prison. But I guess that is the question, Mr. Brackley, and it's possible that Mr. Zaman should speak to it.

Although he has obeyed the conditions of his release up till now, why should I be comfortable that if I give him a month to self report or something like that, he's not going to take off?

MR. BRACKLEY: Judge, his conduct, in all respects, is -- he has been under stress, there's no question about it, but even the reporting of the other arrest, his appearances in court on that matter, and I believe, Judge, his desire to see this thing through, as he has even until today, that I don't believe he's any flight risk, Judge.

There is a concern with his family. I have spoken to him about that at great length. Of course, though,

we were not in a position to have letters from his family or some of his close friends, as usually you would see, and it was an odd kind of a situation.

THE COURT: Well, let me see if I understand that. In other words, you didn't overlook the possibility of getting letters from his family, but you're telling me that he asked you not to let his family know what's going on?

MR. BRACKLEY: From the very beginning, your Honor, that's correct, and for the reasons that he stated to your Honor, that he just did not want to bring the shame upon himself to his family.

THE COURT: And that's helpful because, you know, usually, or often there would be letters like that, but now I know that -- well, Mr. Zaman, do you agree with what Mr. Brackley just told me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Um, I didn't think about my friends, though, for character witnesses and stuff. I could have gotten that for sure. And if -- I basically will appreciate -- I mean, I'm looking at a long sentence and the month will really let me sort out things like, you know, my possessions and, you know, maybe even I'll have to, you know, explain to my family why I'm going to be away for almost four years.

THE COURT: All right. You're not on

```
electronic monitoring now, are you?
 1
                THE DEFENDANT: No.
 2
                THE COURT: I'm -- do you understand that if I
 3
     let you go for about a month and let you self report and
 4
 5
     you take off, it's very likely you're going to get
 6
     caught?
 7
                THE DEFENDANT: I do understand, your Honor.
8
                THE COURT: And when you get caught, you'll
 9
     probably get a couple of extra years for that?
10
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
11
                (Pause.)
12
                THE COURT: All right. Today is Thursday.
     Are you prepared to -- where do you live now, in New
13
     York City?
14
15
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
16
                THE COURT: Do you have a telephone?
17
                THE DEFENDANT: Um, I have one at home and I
18
     have one checked in downstairs.
19
                THE COURT: Okay. But do you have a land-line
20
     phone at home?
21
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
22
                THE COURT: So presumably if I ordered him to
23
     be put on electronic monitoring, that could be
24
     implemented, Mr. Cronin?
25
                PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor.
```

```
MR. BRACKLEY: Judge, just one last request.
 1
     As to the drug program, and I don't know if you said it,
 2
     but would there be a specific recommendation for the
 3
 4
     500-hour program?
 5
                THE COURT: If he's eligible for it and I
     think the sentence is long enough.
 6
 7
           Do you want drug treatment while you're in
 8
     prison?
 9
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
10
                (Pause.)
11
                THE COURT: All right. Mr. Heymann, I'm
12
     inclined to let the defendant self report on April 12th
13
     to the institution designated by the Attorney General,
14
     to permit him to return to New York, to reside in his
15
     apartment, on electronic monitoring, and Pretrial -- I
16
     think it's Probation, I guess, it would be at this
17
     point.
18
                PRETRIAL OFFICER: It would still be Pretrial
19
     Services.
20
                THE COURT: And Pretrial Services can
21
     authorize him to go out for specific reasons at specific
22
     times, but you can only be out at times that are
23
     approved in advance by Pretrial Services, unless you
24
     have a medical emergency or something like that. Do you
25
     understand that?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: So I wouldn't be able to like,
 1
     um -- I wouldn't be able to run errands and stuff?
 2
 3
                THE COURT: Yeah, you wouldn't be able to run
     errands unless you talk to Probation in advance.
 4
 5
                THE DEFENDANT: About what exactly I'm doing?
                THE COURT: Yeah, and if they authorize it.
 6
 7
     And then you can only go where they tell you you can go.
8
                THE DEFENDANT: So basically I'll be under
 9
     house arrest?
10
                THE COURT: Yes, except when they authorize
11
     you to go out.
12
                THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I understand, your
13
     Honor.
14
                THE COURT: The alternative is I've got the
15
     marshal here.
16
                THE DEFENDANT: I know you do. Yes, your
17
     Honor.
18
                THE COURT: The other point is if you're gone
19
     when you're not authorized to be gone, if it turns out
     that you're -- well, just listen -- that you've gone
20
21
     someplace that you're not authorized to go, they'll be
22
     under the direction to take you into custody
23
     immediately. Do you understand that?
24
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
25
                THE COURT: All right. Unless -- does the
```

government want to be heard further on this?

MR. HEYMANN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think, in view of Mr. Zaman's good performance on supervised -- on pretrial release, that I'm persuaded that he's capable of obeying and while there are reasons, stated by the government, that I can't be -- that I can't feel guaranteed that he'll report when he should report, when he must report, I'm reasonably assured that he'll do it. And he's going to be on electronic monitoring. If he's gone, Pretrial Services will know about it promptly. They're ordered to let me know immediately. And they'll be further dire consequences.

So the defendant's release shall continue until April 12th, 2010, when he shall report to the institution designated by the Attorney General of the United States. I will recommend that he be offered the 500-hour drug treatment program. His release will be on the standard conditions and on the additional conditions that he remain at home, subject to electronic monitoring, to be established tomorrow.

You're to return to New York today and, if at all possible, the electronic monitoring is to be established tomorrow, and if not, I assume no later than Monday, and I want to be informed when it's operative. And

Mr. Zaman shall stay in his residence except at times when he's authorized by Pretrial Services to go out to essentially arrange his affairs or for religious or medical reasons. And, again, I'm directing Pretrial Services to inform me promptly if Mr. Zaman violates the conditions of his release.

The previously-imposed drug testing and treatment requirements and reporting requirements will remain in effect.

MR. BRACKLEY: Judge, for incarceration, would it be proper to make a request for a specific housing detention facility, would you entertain such a request?

THE COURT: Well, generally speaking, it's my understanding that the Bureau of Prisons will place the defendant in the facility with the proper designation level that has space and is nearest to his home. So except in extraordinary or very unusual circumstances, I don't make a specific recommendation. But what recommendation would you propose?

MR. BRACKLEY: There's a facility in Morgantown, West Virginia that I have an understanding has an exceptional program with respect to substance abuse and individuals who have gone there have had much success under those conditions.

THE COURT: Well, you and Mr. Zaman can

```
communicate with Probation and particularly with the
 1
     Bureau of Prisons. You can make that request. But I'm
 2
     not making that recommendation for two reasons. One,
 3
 4
     that's really the responsibility of the Bureau of
     Prisons. Two, I think all of the facilities to which he
 5
 6
     might be designated will have drug treatment programs.
 7
     And, three, while I don't suggest he doesn't still have
8
     a drug problem, he's done a good job over the last
     couple of years. And, in fact, if he hadn't, he'd be
 9
10
     going out with the marshals today.
11
           So this is up to you, Mr. Zaman. You're not a
12
     little boy. I know this is hard for you to explain to
13
     your family, but you're going to be gone for close to
14
     four years and I did want to give you an opportunity to
15
     try to handle this in the best way possible.
16
                THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
17
                THE COURT: All right. Is there anything
     further in this matter for today?
18
19
                MR. HEYMANN: No, your Honor.
20
                THE COURT: The Court is in recess.
21
                (Ends, 4:00 p.m.)
22
23
24
```

```
1
                      CERTIFICATE
 2
 3
 4
       I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do
  hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and
 6 accurate transcription of my stenographic notes, on March
  11, 2010, before Chief Judge Mark L. Wolf, to the best of
7 my skill and ability.
8
 9
10
11
   /s/ Richard H. Romanow 04-06-10
   RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```